DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 473 CS 207 007

AUTHOR Towers, Wayne M.
TITLE Newspaper Research and Some Uses-and-Gratifications.
PUB DATE Jul 82
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (65th, Athens, OH, July 25-28, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age; Age Differences; *Attitudes; Behavioral Science Research; Information Sources; *Media Research; *Newspapers; *Reading Habits; *Reading Interests; Surveys; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Readership Analysis

ABSTRACT

A study collected data from 763 door-to-door interviews to test hypotheses about the uses and gratifications associated with newspaper readerships. In the interviews, respondents were identified demographically, asked about their newspaper reading behaviors, and asked to reply to a series of uses and gratifications statements on why they read newspapers: (1) to keep up on the latest events (information/intrapersonal), (2) to be entertained (entertainment/intrapersonal), (3) to give me something to talk about with other people (information/interpersonal), and (4) to show or read items to other people so that they can enjoy them (entertainment/interpersonal). Overall, results showed that everyday readership was related to an information orientation, particularly information for self-use, and this orientation was weakest in the 18-29 age group. Further, regardless of age, the readership pattern of more than one newspaper per day was strongly related toward an entertainment orientation, particularly entertainment for self, while reading only a suburban newspaper was oriented away from self-entertainment. The results indicated that the informational orientation of newspapers would help maintain readership, but that declining orientation toward using newspapers for entertainment could be a source of erosion for newspaper readership. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217473

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NEWSPAPER RESEARCH AND SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wayne M. Towers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Wayne M. Towers, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Department of Journalism
San Diego State University (CA)

Paper presented to the Newspaper Division, Association for Education in Journalism (AEJ), Athens, Ohio, July 25-28, 1982.

The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments and criticisms of Dr. Maxwell McCombs, Director of the Communications Research Center at Syracuse University; Dr. Henry Schulte, Dr. Vernone Sparkes, Dr. Edna Einsiedel, and Professor John Mitchell of Syracuse University; Dr. Lee Becker of Ohio State University; and, Dr. Lynda Lee Kaid of the University of Oklahoma.

CS207007

NEWSPAPER READERSHIP AND SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS

Recent renascence in the uses-and-gratifications research perspective has spurred a burgeoning literature, and has encouraged exhortations for newspaper research to incorporate this perspective into readership studies.[1] Heeding this exhortation, this study will examine the relation of some uses-and-gratifications statements to newspaper readership, and it will also combine those statements with the examination of some long-standing demographic predictors to determine if both research perspectives can be used to enrich each other's insights.

According to British researcher Jay Blumler, findings that result from using the uses-and-gratifications perspective can be expected to fall into three large groupings: cognitive, diversion, and personal identity.[2] The cognitive findings deal with obtaining of information about the surrounding world, and are often labelled as surveillance. The diversion findings center around the concept of entertainment, and include such notions as relaxing, escaping, and passing time. Finally, the personal identity findings deal with interaction in the larger social order, and include such concepts as anticipated communication, social utility for conversation, and social reinforcement.[3]

When Blumler tested these assertions in a survey of 1,000 British adults, the groupings of diversion and personal identity emerged clearly from the data. The cognitive grouping proved more complex, producing two sets of variables: the widely reproduced surveillance grouping, and a second group of statements related to curiosity concerning the surrounding world.[4] Blumler's

data may have been confounded, however, because the study mixed statements related to both newspaper reading and televiewing.[5]

Two recent studies of U.S. newspaper readership have both supported Blumler's triad, however, and have added some complexities of their own. Lee Becker sutdied two sets of voters and a set of Northeastern U.S. newspaper readers and found: a cognitive grouping labelled surveillance/vote guidance; a diversion grouping labelled avoidance; and, a catchall grouping that included the personal identity notions of reinforcement and communicatory utility.[6] Although Becker's results were also somewhat confounded because of emphasis on politics as well as newspapers, the thrust of the findings generally supported Blumler's three conceptual distinctions.

Similarly, when Judee and Michael Burgoon studied newspaper readership in five U.S. cities, they also identified a diversion grouping called redundancy and entertainment; a personal identity grouping called social extension; and, two cognitive groupings: immediacy and thoroughness, a compilation of surveillance statements referring to news in general; and, local awareness, a compilation of surveillance statements applied specifically to local news.[7] Despite this latter distinction between general and local news in terms of cognition, the Burgoons' findings were also generally supportive of Blumler's triad.

Despite difference in specific topic areas, the three studies discussed above generally supported the tripartite notion of cognition, diversion, and personal identity. A key source of confusion appeared to be the mixing of generalized and specific uses-and-gratifications statements within the three studies. To

avoid these complexities, this study will focus only on four generalized uses-and-gratifications statements, and leave the elaborations related to those statements for future research. Two simple distinctions will be related to Blumler's triad, then tested. The first distinction will be between the long-standing difference between information, material for participation in the everyday world; and, entertainment, material for withdrawal from the everyday world.[8] The second distinction will be between intrapersonal, or self-oriented, use of media; and, interpersonal, or other-oriented, use of media, particularly newspapers.[9]

Use of these long-standing terms provides some assistance in unravelling the complexities of the findings from recent research. Both Blumler's cognitive and diversion groupings are essentially intrapersonal, although the former is information-oriented, while the latter is entertainment-oriented. When these broader categories are used, discrepancies like Blumler's surveillance and curiosity; Becker's surveillance/vote guidance; and the Burgoons' immediacy and thoroughness and local awareness and utility can be grouped under the broader combination of information/intrapersonal. Similarly, the respective groupings of diversion, avoidance, and redundancy and entertainment can be grouped under the broader combination of entertainment/intrapersonal.

This combining of intrapersonal with information and entertainment is important because a closer look at Blumler's grouping of personal identity indicates that it too is information-oriented, but its orientation toward larger social contexts gives it more of an interpersonal cast. This study's

addition of the self-oriented versus other-oriented distinction allowed it to distinguish between the information/intrapersonal orientation of Blumler's cognitive concept, and the information/interpersonal orientation of his personal identity concept. Again, this identification of a broader notion called information/interpersonal allows the grouping of specific findings from the three recent uses-and-gratiifcations studies considered above: Blumler's personal identity findings; Becker's catchall findings of reinforcement and communicatory utility; and, the Burgoons' findings of social extension.

Finally, the combining of the concepts of information and entertainment with the concepts of intrapersonal and interpersonal allows the study to argue from symmetry for a fourth combination: entertainment/interpersonal, the diversion of others with mass media, including newspapers. Although such a combination does not appear to be well-grounded in the newspaper literature, it has appeared in research on the use of phonograph records by adolescents,[10] and of television by all age groups.[11]

Based on these concepts, this study will test the following four hypotheses for relations between newspaper readership and uses-and-gratifications statements:

H_1: Newspaper readership practices will be predicted by orientation toward using newspaper for self-information (information/intrapersonal).

H_2: Newspaper readership practices will be predicted by orientation toward using newspaper for self-entertainment (entertainment/intrapersonal).

H_3: Newspaper readership practices will be predicted by orientation toward using newspaper for information to use in relations with others (information/interpersonal).

H_4: Newspaper readership practices will be predicted by orientation toward using newspaper for entertaining others (entertainment/interpersonal).

Because of the many complex activities subsumed under the concept of newspaper readership, only two readership practices will be considered in this study: (1) level of readership -- reading the newspaper everyday versus reading the newspaper less than everyday; and, (2) pattern of readership -- reading more than one newspaper each day versus reading only one newspaper each day. As a further control, single newspaper readership will be divided into reading a morning metropolitan, an evening metropolitan, or a daily suburban newspaper because of conceptual differences among the three types.[12] Non-readers of newspapers will not be examined because of the growing importance of examining regular versus less regular readers of newspapers,[13] and because non-readers tend to be demographically different from newspaper readers.[14]

The latter distinction is particularly important because comparisons of demographic and uses-and-gratifications statements as predictors of newspaper readership in Australia indicated that demographics were stronger predictors than were uses-and-gratifications.[15] As a precaution against this potential pitfall being replicated among U.S. newspaper readers, the study used four productive demographic predictors for comparative purposes:

age, with its expectation that newspaper readership increases as age increases; education, with its expectation that newspaper readership increases as level of education increases; race, with its expectation that whites have higher levels of newspaper readership than non-whites; and, sex, with its expectation that males have slightly higher levels of newspaper readership than do females.[16]

Because of these demographic precautions, the study will also test the following four hypotheses related to newspaper readership:

H_5: Newspaper readership will increase as age increases.

H_6: Newspaper readership will increase as education increases.

H_7: Newspaper readership will be higher among whites than among non-whites.

H_8: Newspaper readership will be higher among males than among females.

Finally, since sets of hypotheses have been offered for both demographic and uses-and-gratifications variables, some distinction should be made concerning the precedence of the two perspectives. In addition to the Australian study cited above, U.S. studies have indicated the precedence of age,[17] education,[18] and race[19] over uses-and-gratifications concepts. Based on this literature, the final hypothesis examined was:

H_9: Newspaper readership practices will be more strongly predicted by demographic variables than by uses-and-gratifications statements.

This final hypothesis argues that uses-and-gratifications would be expected to be a supplement to commonly reported

demographic insights.

METHOD

At a client's request, a two county area in New England was the site for 763 verified door-to-door interviews conducted from November 7, 1975 to December 12, 1975. The data were kept confidential after a 1976 reporting for five years to protect the client's competitive situation.

In the interviews, the respondents were identified demographically; asked a series of questions about their newspaper readership behavior; and, asked to reply great deal, somewhat, or not at all to a series of uses-and-gratifications statements concerning newspapers. The uses-and-gratifications statements used in this study were: (1) To keep up with latest events (information/intrapersonal); (2) To be entertained (entertainment/intrapersonal); (3) To give me something to talk about with other people (information/interpersonal); and, (4) To show or read items to other people so that they can enjoy them (entertainment/interpersonal).

The gathered data were analyzed using version seven of SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Simple relations were examined using the chi-square test for statistical significance and Cramér's phi-prime for statistical association. Complex relations were explored using canonical correlation analysis. To open use of the nominal data to this multiple variable technique, the levels of the variables were transformed to approximate interval data through the process of effect coding with the values of +1, 0, and -1.[20] The implied variables created by -1 coding have been restored and included in the reporting of the canonical loadings, and are identified

by being enclosed in quotation marks.

RESULTS

For the sake of convenience, the study's results will be presented first in terms of level of readership (everyday versus less than everyday), then in terms of readership pattern (multiple newspaper readership versus readership of only morning metropolitan, evening metropolitan, or suburban newspapers).

Level of readership. Of the four uses-and-gratifications statements involved in this study, only the two information-oriented statements produced statistically significant differences in simple crosstabulation: information/intrapersonal (To keep up with latest events); and, information/interpersonal (To give me something to talk about with other people).

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Table 1 shows the crosstabulation of level of readership with the information/intrapersonal statement. Note that agreement with this statement was so strong that somewhat and not at all replies had to be collapsed into a more general category called less than great deal to avoid problems with empty cells and small n-sizes. In the table, everyday readers were more likely to reply great deal to the information/intrapersonal statement (84.9%) than were less than everyday readers (70.7%), although both groups of readers were generally oriented toward the statement. This finding supports Hypothesis 1's contention that newspaper readership will be predicted by orientation toward using newspaper for self-information (information/intrapersonal).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 2 shows the crosstabulation of level of readership with the information/interpersonal statement. Everyday readers were more likely to be oriented toward the statement (87.6% for great deal versus 76.3% for not at all), while less than everyday readers were more likely to be oriented away (12.4% versus 23.8%). Again, both groups of readers had some orientation toward the statement, but everyday readers had a stronger orientation in that direction. This finding supports Hypothesis 3's contention that newspaper readership will be predicted by orientation toward using newspaper for materials to use in relations with others.

The inability of the two entertainment statements to produce statistically significant differences in terms of level of readership failed to support Hypotheses 2 and 4, and indicated that everyday readership was strongly oriented toward information for use both intrapersonally and interpersonally.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

When the four demographic variables were also crosstabulated with level of readership, only age produced statistically significant differences. Table 3 shows this single significant relationship, and indicates that although everyday newspaper readership was high in all age groups, it was weakest among 18-29 year olds (59.6%). This finding meant that the 18-29 year olds could be distinguished from their elders by having a slightly lower level of everyday readership. This relation supported Hypothesis 5's contention that newspaper readership increased with increasing age, but lack of significance for

the other three demographic combinations did not support the contentions of Hypotheses 6,7, and 8 concerning education, race, and sex respectively.

Overall, everyday newspaper readership was related to the informational uses-and-gratifications of information/intrapersonal and information/interpersonal, as well as to the demographic variable of age. Since each of these three variables was tested separately, their interactions could not be identified from the simple crosstabulations. To test for more complex relations, the uses-and-gratifications statements, the demographic variables, and level of newspaper readership were effect-coded, and submitted to canonical correlation analysis.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Table 4 shows the canonical loadings that emerged from the canonical correlation analysis. Because the dependent variable of level of readership had only one degree of freedom, only this single solution was possible. Note that canonical loadings are interpreted in the same fashion as factor analytic loadings, only the distinction between independent and dependent variables can be maintained for analysis. The levels of the variables used for this analysis have been listed all in capitals to indicate that they have been effect-coded, and the restored levels that had been coded -1 for the analysis are indicated by being enclosed in quotation marks.

Of the resulting two variable sets, the dependent variables are easiest to interpret. In Table 4, EVERYDAY readership (+1.00) is the opposite of "LESS THAN EVERYDAY" readership (-1.00). This

distinction means that among the independent variables, the positive values will be oriented toward everyday readership, while the negative values will be oriented toward less than everyday readership.

In Table 4, the age variable produced both the strongest positive effect-coded variable (SIXTIES: +0.615)and the strongest negative effect-coded variable ("TWENTIES": -0.927). The second strongest effect-coded variables were produced by the information/ intrapersonal statement: GREAT DEAL (+0.392) for the positive loadings, and "LESS THAN GREAT DEAL" (-0.392) for the negative loadings.

After these two strong variables, the other effect-coded variables began producing mixed results. But, since the canonical loadings were linear combinations of the data, the various effect-coded variables could be summed to produce composite scores for the original variables. When the sums were calculated, the age variable again emerged as strongest, with a total positive loading of +0.944 (the sum of +0.615 for SIXTIES; +0.263 for FIFTIES; and, +0.066 for THIRTIES); and, a total negative loading of -0.944 (the sum of -0.927 for "TWENTIES" plus -0.017 for FORTIES).

When the summing procedure was repeated for the remaining effect-coded variables in Table 4, the information/intrapersonal statement still remained in second place with a positive sum of +0.392 for GREAT DEAL, and a negative sum of -0.392 for "LESS THAN GREAT DEAL." The third variable to emerge was information/interpersonal, with a positive sum of +0.263 for GREAT DEAL, and a negative sum of -0.263 for SOMEWHAT (-0.082)

and "NOT AT ALL" (-0.192).

These sums meant that age would be expected to be the strongest predictor, followed by replies to the information/intrapersonal statement, then by replies to the information/interpersonal statement. These findings supported Hypothesis 9's notion that demographic predictors would be stronger than uses-and-gratifications predictors.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

As a check on these findings, the simple crosstabulation between level of readership and age in Table 3, which was identified as the strongest relationship, was expanded to a three-way crosstabulation by the addition of the information/intrapersonal statement as a control variable. This combination is shown in Table 5, and reinforces the notion that 18-29 year olds had lower levels of everyday newspaper readership than did older newspaper readers.

Table 5 also shows that everyday readers were more likely to reply great deal to the information/intrapersonal statement (84.8%) than they were to reply less than a great deal (70.6%). Further, this difference was consistent across all age groups, with the lowest levels again appearing in the 18-29 age group (68.2% and 45.0%). This combined crosstabulation reinforces the notion that 18-29 year olds have lower levels of newspaper readership, and links that difference to orientation toward information/intrapersonal, which grows stronger as age advances.

The addition of information/interpersonal as a second control variable to Table 5's threeway crosstabulation (not shown) produce a mixture of results that included few statistically

significant differences and which did not greatly alter the basic differences between 18-29 year olds and their elders, and the linkage of that difference to information/intrapersonal. At best, the addition of information/interpersonal offered a weak elaboration on the fundamental relations of Table 5.

Overall, everyday readership was predicted by the key distinction between 18-29 year olds and older age groups, and this distinction was strongly related to information/intrapersonal. These findings encouraged the interpretation that 18-29 year olds do have lower levels of newspaper readership, an assertion well-founded in the literature,[21] and that this difference was related to the use of newspapers for self-information.

Readership pattern. For the second newspaper variable of readership pattern, only two of the four uses-and-gratifications statements produced statistically significant differences in simple crosstabulations. This time, however, instead of the two information-oriented statements emerging as significant, the honors went to the two intrapersonally-oriented statements: information/intrapersonal (To keep up with latest events) for the second time in this study, and entertainment/intrapersonal (To be entertained) for the first time.

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

Table 6 shows the simple crosstabulation of newspaper readership pattern with the information/intrapersonal statement. Again, agreement with this statement was so strong that only the distinction between great deal and less than great deal could be maintained. Table 6 indicates that multiple

newspaper readers were more likely to agree with the information/intrapersonal statement (38.0%), while single copy readers were not, although evening metropolitan readers did show the slightest margin of agreement (21.4%). These findings meant that multiple newspaper readers were more strongly self-information oriented than were single copy readers. This distinction gives further, but weaker, support to Hypothesis 1's contention in favor of the information/intrapersonal statement.

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Table 7 shows the crosstabulation of readership pattern with the entertainment/intrapersonal statement. Multiple newspaper readers (37.6%), evening metropolitan newspaper readers (25.4%), and morning metropolitan newspaper readers (18.8%) were oriented toward the statement, while suburban readers were not (40.7%). These findings meant that multiple newspaper readers and readers of metropolitan newspapers tended to be oriented toward self-entertainment with newspapers, while suburban readers were not. This relation generally supports Hypothesis 2's contention in favor of the entertainment/intrapersonal statement, although the support was somewhat qualified by the opposition of suburban newspaper readers.

The inability of the two interpersonal statements to produce statistically significant differences in terms of readership pattern argued against Hypotheses 3 and 4, and argued that choosing to read one or more newspapers was related to intrapersonal uses of both information and entertainment, but that it was not oriented toward interpersonal uses.

TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

When the four demographic variables were crosstabulated with readership pattern, only two variables, age and sex produced statistically significant difference. Age had also been significant in its relation to level of newspaper readership, but sex had not.

Table 8 shows the crosstabulation of age with readership pattern. This time, instead of the distinction between 18-29 year olds and their elders again being reinforced, a new distinction emerged, this time between 18-39 year olds and their elders.

In terms of multiple newspaper readership, 18-29 year olds (23.9%) and 30-39 year olds (22.3%) were notably lower than their elders. The opposite of this difference occurs in single copy readership, however, where both 18-29 year olds (26.6%) and 30-39 year olds (26.9%) are higher than their elders in reading only an evening metropolitan newspaper. Further, 18-29 year olds also show the highest level of suburban single copy readership (33.9%), while 30-39 year olds show the highest level of reading only a morning metropolitan newspaper (21.5%).

Overall, these findings from Table 8 indicated that newspaper readers over the age of 40 were more likely to read more than one newspaper each day, while readers under 40 were more likely to read only one newspaper each day. This tendency toward multiple newspaper readership among older readers meant that newspaper readership tended to be higher within the 40 years and older age group than

within the 18-39 years old age group, a strong supporting of Hypothesis 5.

TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

Table 9 shows the crosstabulation of readership pattern by sex. Men were more likely to read multiple newspapers (38.7%) and morning metropolitan newspapers (19.4%), while women were more likely to read suburban newspapers (29.3%) and evening metropolitan newspapers (25.4%). Since multiple readership conceptually represented a higher degree of newspaper readership, these findings supported Hypothesis 8's contention that men were more likely to have higher amounts of newspaper readership than women.

The inability of the other two demographic variables of education and race to produce statistically significant differences failed to support Hypotheses 6 and 7. Overall, newspaper readership pattern was related to the intrapersonal uses-and-gratifications of information/intrapersonal and entertainment/intrapersonal, as well as to the demographic variables of age and sex. Again, since each of these variables were tested separately, their interrelations had to be examined using the multiple variable technique of canonical correlation.

TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE

Table 10 shows the canonical loadings that emerged from the canonical correlation analysis related to newspaper readership pattern. Because readership pattern had three degrees of freedom, three sets of solutions were possible. However, only two solutions emerged as statistically significant using a chi-square goodness-of-fit test.

First solution. The first solution in Table 10 distinguished reading multiple newspapers (+0.630) and only an evening metropolitan newspaper (+0.475), from reading only a suburban newspaper (-0.950) and, to a lesser extent, reading only a morning metropolitan newspaper (-0.155).

In this first solution, the three strongest predictor groupings were (in order): (1) the entertainment/intrapersonal statement (± 0.885 total), with extremes at GREAT DEAL (+0.548) and "NOT AT ALL" (-0.885); (2) age (± 0.584 total), with extremes at FIFTIES (+0.310) and "TWENTIES" (-0.431); and, (3) education (± 0.538), with extremes at HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED (+0.302) and "LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION" (-0.341). Note that this ordering placed a uses-and-gratifications statement ahead of the demographic variables, and so did not support the contention of Hypothesis 9 that demographic variables would precede uses-and-gratifications statements.

TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

The ordering in Table 10 highlighted the strength of the relationship between readership pattern and entertainment/intrapersonal that was discussed in Table 7. When age was added as the first control variable to the simple relation of Table 7, the resulting group of tables produced only mixed support for the basic insights of the simple crosstabulation.

In Table 7, multiple newspaper readers and metropolitan newspaper readers were oriented toward entertainment/intrapersonal, while suburban readers were oriented away. When age was added as a control variable as a control variable, these simple insights became much more complex.

In Table 11, all of the age groupings produced statistically significant differences except the 30-39 years old grouping. Across all age groupings, multiple newspaper readers remained oriented toward entertainment/intrapersonal, while suburban newspaper readers remained oriented away. Complexities arose, however, among metropolitan newspaper readers.

Evening metropolitan newspaper readers in Table 11 produced a younger-older distinction by being oriented toward the entertainment/intrapersonal statement in the 40-49 (12.5%), 50-59 (25.0%), and 60 and older (28.1%) age groupings; while the 18-29 age grouping (22.7%) was oriented slightly away from the statement. This distinction meant that the older evening metropolitan readers were more likely to read for self-entertainment than were the younger readers.

On the other hand, morning metropolitan readers presented an even more complex picture in Table 11 by reversing the relations in the younger-older distinction. For morning metropolitan newspaper readers, younger readers in the 18-29 (15.2%) and 40-49 (28.1%) groups were oriented toward the entertainment/intrapersonal statement, while the 50-59 (19.2%) and 60 and older (26.4%) age groups were oriented away.

This latter distinction created five sub-groups within readers of only a metropolitan newspaper: (1) 18-29 year old evening metropolitan readers who were oriented away from self-entertainment; (2) 18-29 year old morning metropolitan readers who were oriented toward self-entertainment; (3) 40-49 year old morning metropolitan readers who were oriented toward self-entertainment; (4) 50 years and older morning metropolitan readers who were oriented away

from self-entertainment; and, (5) 40 years and older evening metropolitan readers who were oriented toward self-entertainment.

Broadly speaking, these differences meant that metropolitan newspapaper readers 50 years of age or older tended to associate entertainment/intrapersonal with the evening newspaper, but not with the morning newspaper. Metropolitan newspaper readers in the 18-29 age group took the opposite tack, and associated entertainment/intrapersonal with the morning newspaper, but not the evening newspaper. This difference would indicate a distinction between the two groups in terms of the part of the day in which they consumed a metropolitan newspaper for self-entertainment, with the younger readers preferring the morning, and the older readers preferring the evening.

This simple explanation is muddled, however, by the 40-49 year old readers of both kinds of metropolitan newspapers being oriented toward entertainment/intrapersonal, while 30-39 year old readers produced no statistically significant differences at all.These discrepancies argue for a change much more complex than a simple young-old distinction.

A plausible and attractive explanation for this complexity can be developed by looking at the ranges of birth years for the age groups in this study. The respondents 50 years of age and older were born before or during 1925, and so would have started growing up just before the Depression years of the 1930's, and during the time when the relatively new medium of radio was in its infancy. This group could be expected to have experienced newspaper as a medium of entertainment prior to or simultaneous with the growth of radio as an entertainment medium.

Following this arguement, the respondents in the 40-49 years old age group were born during the period 1926-1935, and grew up with the Depression, as well as with the burgeoning of radio as a mass medium. This group could be identified as being more directly experienced with radio as a simultaneous and alternative medium to newspapers. At the minimum, this group can be interpreted as having different historical experiences from the preceding age group.

Similarly, the 30-39 age group in this study, which was born during 1936 and 1945, experienced a different world than did the study's two preceding generations. This group not only experienced radio as a full-blown medium, it also experienced World War Two and the Korean Conflict as major historical events reported on the well-established media of newspaper and radio, and on the emerging medium of television. The advent of television could have been as profound a change as the burgeoning of radio for the study's 50 years of age and older grouping.

Finally, the 18-29 age group in the study was born between 1946 and 1947, the dawn of television as a major medium in the United States. Although much speculation surrounds this age grouping, it is only now slowly moving into the age ranges where meaningful comparisons with the past can be conducted.

These generational differences would provide a handy explanation for the differences in metropolitan newspaper readers' orientations toward entertainmnet/intrapersonal, but such a explanation must remain largely speculative.

Since the study itself was a one-time only survey, it cannot hope to measure and report historical trends. Since relevant age ranges are only now beginning to emerge within the population, effective measures of change are still somewhat in the future. At best, the muddled orientations of metropolitan newspaper readers toward entertainment/intrapersonal can be used to point toward the possibility of generational change, but resolution of that possibility remains in the future. Based on the data at hand, the best insights available are that multiple newspaper readers tend to be oriented toward self-entertainment through newspapers, while suburban newspaper readers tend to be oriented away. Metropolitan newspaper readers produce a mixed group of orientations, particularly when different age groups are considered. At the minimum, this mixture points toward a highly volatile set of orientations toward self-entertainment among metropolitan newspaper readers.

Finally, in terms of the first canonical correlation solution for readership pattern, the addition of education as the second control variable did not resolve the complexities produced by the addition of the age variable as a control for the basic relation between entertainment/intrapersonal and readership pattern. The resulting crosstabulations were so plagued by small n-sizes and empty cells that they could not be used (not shown). At best, the complicated solution of the threeway crosstabulation of newspaper readership pattern, entertainment/intrapersonal, and age represented the basic insights related to the data set in terms of the first solution in Table 10's canonical correlation.

Second solution. The second solution in Table 10 separated reading multiple newspapers (+0.879) from reading only an evening metropolitan newspaper (-0.879). Summing of the canonical loadings indicated that the following order could be used: (1) age (±1.099 total), with extremes at FORTIES (+0.497) and THIRTIES (-0.627); (2) education (±0.455 total), with extremes at COLLEGE COMPLETED (+0.455) and "LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION" (-0.309); and, (3) sex (±0.349 total), with extremes at "MALE" (+0.349) and FEMALE (-0.349). Note that this ordering incorporated only demographic variables, supporting Hypothesis 9's contention of the precedence of demographic variables over uses-and-gratifications statements.

The ordering in the second solution empahsized the importance of the relationship between age and readership pattern. This relationship, which was discussed in terms of Table 8, argued for lower levels of multiple readership among respondents in the 18-39 years old age grouping, and higher levels of single newspaper readership within that same age grouping. When education was added as a control variable to the simple crosstabulation of Table 8, no statistically significant differences emerged (not shown). This lack of statistical significance meant that age was an important predeictor of newspaper readership pattern, and that the distinction between 18-39 year old and 40 years and older readers was useful to maintain.

Overview. Although level of newspaper readership produced a relatively simple combination of everyday readership predicted by orientation toward information/intrapersonal at differing

age levels, the variable of readership patterns produced much more complicated relations. First, without regard to age groupings, readers of multiple newspapers were consistently oriented toward the entertainment/intrapersonal statement, while readers of only a suburban newspaper were consistently oriented away. But, second, the orientations of readers of only a single metropolitan newspaper varied in terms of combinations of age grouping and morning versus evening newspaper. Although these latter differences were difficult to explain from a conceptual perspective, they did raise the tantalizing possibility of generational differences based on historical experience -- a topic well beyond the purview of a one-time-only field survey.

Overall, the combinations of uses-and-gratifications statements, demographic variables, and newspaper readership practices indicated that everyday readership was related to an information orientation, particularly information for self-AV, and that this orientation was weakest in the 18-29 age group.

Further, regardless of age, the readership pattern of more than one newspaper per day was strongly related toward an entertainment orientation, particularly entertainment for the self; while reading only a suburban newspaper was oriented away from self-entertianment. Age, however, did emerge as a factor among readers of only a single metropolitan newspaper, with generational differences among the age groupings as a potential explanation for some complicated findings.

Finally, although demographics preceded uses-and-gratifications

in explaining differences between everyday and less than everyday newspaper readership, the precedence was reversed for patterns of readership, with the uses-and-gratifications statement of entertainment/intrapersonal preceding demographic variables. This reversal of precedence indicated that the demographic and uses-and-gratifications variables are probably interrelated, and that they should be considered together in explaining newspaper readership.

DISCUSSION

In terms of Blumler's triad of cognitive, diversion, and personal identity, the study's variables of information/intrapersonal, entertainment/intrapersonal, and information/interpersonal did provide some degree of replication. Of the three terms used in this study, the information/intrapersonal combination proved strongest in terms of newspaper readership, producing significant differences for both level of newspaper readership (reading a newspaper everyday versus less than everyday) and readership pattern (reading more than one newspaper each day versus versus reading only one newspaper each day).

The other two uses-and-gratifications statements were less consistent, however, with the entertainment/intrapersonal statement linking strongly only to readership pattern, while the information/interpersonal statement linked only marginally to level of readership. These weaker relationships indicated that newspaper readership was most strongly tied to information for the self, with a secondary relation to entertainment for the self, and with a distant relation to information for

interpersonal use. The triad was duplicated for newspaper readership, but that duplication depended heavily on the type of newspaper readership practice under consideration.

Further, the symmetrical concept of entertainment/interpersonal which had emerged in other media, was not reproduced in newspaper readership. This statistical non-significance, combined with the relative weakness of the information/interpersonal statement argued that newspaper readership is primarily an intrapersonal action, with only marginal reinforcement from interpersonal orientations.

When long-standing demographic variables were added as controls in the consideration of the uses-and-gratifications statements, these more traditional explanations did not supplant the newer perspective; instead, both perspectives supplemented each other. Among the demographic variables, age emerged as a key predictor variable, with some secondary explanation in terms of the newspaper reader's gender. Overall, however, the age variable, and particularly that variable's groupings of 18-29, 30-39, and 40 and older proved helpful in examining the prediction of newspaper readership practices. In general, newspaper readership was lower in the younger age groupings but the uses-and-gratifications statements added some supplementary insights to the long-standing insights related to age and newspaper readership.

The first insight was that the distinction between 18-29 year olds and older newspaper readers was information/intrapersonal oriented. The younger age grouping was lower on readership and on orientation toward using newspaper for

self-information. This difference was not very large, however, and could reflect a simple life cycle difference such as less established young adults may not yet have developed the information needs that newspaper readership satisfies.

The second insight, however, could prove more troublesome. By and large, readers of more than one newspaper per day showed an orientation toward entertainment/intrapersonal regardless of age, and so their readership can be explained at least partly in terms of deriving entertainment from newspapers. Suburban readers, on the other hand, were generally oriented away from self-entertainment from newspapers, perhaps reflecting a more utilitarian attitude toward newspapers, or, more negatively, reflecting a habitual rather than a motivated consumption of newspapers.

Far more troublesome, however, was the mixed orientations toward entertainment/intrapersonal produced by readers of only one metropolitan newspaper each day. This mixture of findings could simply reflect a mixture of diverse orientations within the metropolitan newspaper readership. On the other hand, the particular confusion caused by adding the age variable as a control could be an early warning of generational change in terms of orientation toward deriving self-entertainment from newspaper.

Longitudinal studies have indicated that while differences between the 1950's and later generations,and the pre-television generations are not that great in terms of reading a newspaper, total newspaper readership is declining, and it is declining across

all age groups.[22] The findings from this study would indicate that the stability across age groups would be a function of maintaining an informational orientation toward newspapers that would be expected to increase as progress through the life cycle imposes information needs that can be met at least in part by newspapers. The overall decline in readership, however, could be attributed to a long-term generational decline in viewing newspapers as entertaining. Such a change would mean that newsapers would face a period of decline until some level of stability would be reached based on newspapers' ability to serve largely utilitarian functions, while entertainment orientations gradually changed or eroded. While newspapers have taken some pains to upgrade their informational posture, a wise additional tactic could be to consider evaluating their entertainment posture.

Admittedly, such larger questions cannot be addressed within the confines of a single, one-shot field survey. What is important, and what represents a call to future research and action, is that such a larger issue could have surfaced to muddle the data within a single field survey. Waiting for present generations to age could be too late: the dimension of change in entertainment orientations toward newspapers recommends prompt and proper evaluation. The intermixing of established demographic variables and newer uses-and-gratifications statements augurs well for the success of such explorations.

#

NOTES

[1]John P. Robinson and Leo W. Jeffries, "The Great Age Readership Mystery," Journalism Quarterly 58 (Summer 1981), p. 224.

[2]Jay G. Blumler, "The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratifications Studies," Communication Research, 6 (1979), pp. 18-20.

[3]Ibid., pp. 18-20.

[4]Ibid., pp. 26-27.

[5]Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[6]Lee B. Becker, "Measurement of Gratifications," Communication Research, 6 (1979), p. 71.

[7]Judee K. Burgoon and Michael Burgoon, "The Functions of the Daily Newspaper," Newspaper Research Journal, 4 (July 1981), p. 32.

[8]Walter Weiss, "Mass Communication," in Paul H. Mussen and Mark R. Rosenzweig (eds.) Annual Review of Psychology, vol. 22 (Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1971), p. 312;Elihu Katz, Jay G. Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch, "Uses and Gratifications Research," Public Opinion Quarterly, 37 (Winter 1973-1974), p. 20; Elihu Katz, Jay G. Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch, "Uses of Mass Communication by the Individual," in W. Phillips Davison and Frederick T. C. Yu (eds.) Mass Communication Research: Major Issues and Future Directions (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974), pp. 14-15; Elihu Katz, Jay G. Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch, "Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual," in Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974), p. 227; Karl Erik Rosengren and Swen Windahl, "Mass Media Consumption as a Functional Alternative," in Denis McQuail (ed.) Sociology of Mass Communications (Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1972), pp. 177-178; William J. McGuire, "Psychological Motives and Communication Gratification," in Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974), pp. 173; 183-184.

[9]Bernard Berelson, "What Missing the Newspaper Means," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton (eds.), Communications Research (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 117-121; 129.

[10]Peter Clarke, "Teenagers' Coorientation and Information-Seeking about Pop Music," American Behavioral Scientist 16 (March-April 1973), pp. 551-552.

[11]James Lull, "The Social Uses of Television," Human Communication Research 6 (Spring 1980), pp. 203-204.

[12]John C. Schweitzer, David H. Weaver, and Gerald C. Stone, "Morning-Evening Circulation: What Effect Do Appearance and Content Have?," Journalism Quarterly 54 (Autumn 1977), p. 517; "When Adults and Teenagers Read Their Newspaper," in Chilton R. Bush (ed.) News Research for Better Newspapers, vol. 4 (New York: American Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation, 1979), p. 51; Leo Bogart, "The Future of the Metropolitan Daily," Journal of Communication 25 (Spring 1975), p. 36.

[13]Leonard Tipton, "ANPA Newspaper Readership Studies," ANPA News Research Report (12 July 1978), p. 2.

[14]Bruce Westley and Werner J. Severin, "A Profile of the Daily Newspaper Non-Reader," Journalism Quarterly 41 (Winter 1964), pp. 46-47; Galen R. Rarick, "Differences Between Daily Newspaper Subscribers and Nonsubscribers," Journalism Quarterly 50 (Summer 1973), pp. 266-269; Jeanne Penrose, David H. Weaver, Richard R. Cole, and Donald L. Shaw, "The Newspaper Non-Reader 10 Years Later: A Partial Replication of Westley-Severin," Journalism Quarterly 51 (Winter 1974), pp. 632-634.

[15]Susan Kippax and John P. Murray, "Using the Mass Media: Need Gratification and Perceived Utility," Communication Research 7 (July 1980), p. 353.

[16]William L. Rivers, "The Press as a Communication System," in Ithiel de Sola Pool, Wilbur Schramm, Frederick N. Frey, Nathan Maccoby, and Edwin B. Parker (eds.) Handbook of Communication (Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Company, 1973), p. 541; Jack M. McLeod and Sun Yuel Choe, "An Analysis of Five Factors Affecting Newspaper Circulation," ANPA News Research Report (14 March 1978), pp. 1-6; Leonard Tipton, "ANPA Newspaper Readership Studies," ANPA News Research Report (12 July 1978), p. 2; Leo Bogart, Press and Public (Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1981), pp. 66; 69; 70-76; 82-83.

[17]Leo W. Jeffries, "Functions of Media Behaviors," Communication Research 2 (April 1975), pp. 153; 157.

[18]Wilbur Schramm and David M. White, "Age, Education, Economic Status: Factors in Newspaper Reading," Journalism Quarterly 26 (June 1949), p. 153.

[19]Carl E. Block, "Communicating with the Urban Poor: An Exploratory Inquiry," Journalism Quarterly 47 (Spring 1970), p. 7.

[20]Fred N. Kerlinger and Elazur J. Pedhazur, Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973), pp. 121; 151.

[21]John P. Robinson and Leo W. Jeffries, "The Changing Role of Newspapers in the Age of Television," Journalism Monographs, 63 (September 1979), p. 3.

[22]John P. Robinson, "The Changing Reading Habits of the American Public," Journal of Communication 30 (Winter 1980), p. 143.

#

TABLE 1

CROSSTABULATION: DAILY READERSHIP
BY INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL VARIABLE

	Information/Intrapersonal[a]		
	Great deal	Less than great deal	(Total)
Everyday	84.9%	70.7%	(80.9%)
Less than everyday	15.1%	29.5%	(19.1%)
(n)	(476)	(183)	659

$\chi^2 = 16.76$; df = 1; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.1595$

[a]The information/intrapersonal statement used in this study was: To keep up with latest events.

TABLE 2

CROSSTABULATION: DAILY READERSHIP BY INFORMATION/INTERPERSONAL VARIABLE

	Information/Interpersonal[a]			
	Great deal	Somewhat	Not at all	(Total)
Everyday	87.6%	78.3%	76.3%	(81.0%)
Less than everyday	12.4%	21.7%	23.8%	(19.0%)
(n)	(225)	(272)	(160)	657

$\chi^2 = 9.90$; df = 2; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.1228$

[a]The information/interpersonal statement used in this study was: To give me something to talk about with other people.

TABLE 3

CROSSTABULATION: DAILY READERSHIP BY AGE

	Age in years					
	29 and under	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 and over	(Total)
Everyday	59.6%	79.2%	80.3%	84.6%	91.8%	(80.4%)
Less than everyday	40.4%	20.8%	19.7%	15.4%	8.2%	(19.6%)
(n)	(109)	(130)	(132)	(123)	(170)	664

$\chi 2 = 45.26$; $df = 4$; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.2611$

TABLE 4

CANONICAL CORRELATION: DAILY READERSHIP BY DEMOGRAPHIC AND USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS VARIABLES

Independent/Predictor Variables	Canonical loading(s)
	I
SIXTIES	+0.615
INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	+0.392
FIFTIES	+0.263
INFORMATION/INTERPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	+0.233
ENTERTAINMENT/INTERPERSONAL: SOMEWHAT	+0.197
WHITE	+0.103
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED	+0.102
THIRTIES	+0.066
SOME EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL	+0.017
"ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL: NOT AT ALL"	+0.016
ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	+0.007
FEMALE	-0.003
"LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED"	-0.007
FORTIES	-0.017
ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL: SOMEWHAT	-0.023
INFORMATION/INTERPERSONAL: SOMEWHAT	-0.082
"NONWHITE"	-0.103
COLLEGE COMPLETED	-0.112
"INFORMATION/INTERPERSONAL: NOT AT ALL"	-0.151
ENTERTAINMENT/INTERPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	-0.192
"INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL: LESS THAN GREAT DEAL"	-0.392
"TWENTIES"	-0.927
Dependent/Criterion Variable	
EVERYDAY	+1.000
"LESS THAN EVERYDAY"	-1.000
Eigenvalue(s)	0.100
Canonical correlation(s)	0.315
Wilk's lambda	0.900
Increments in Wilk's lambda	-----
χ^2	66.68
(df)	(16)
Level of significance	$p \leq 0.01$

TABLE 5

CROSSTABULATION: DAILY READERSHIP BY AGE CONTROLLED FOR INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL VARIABLE

Information/Intrapersonal[a]	Age in years					
Great deal[b]	29 and under	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 and above	(Total)
Everyday	68.2%	80.2%	84.4%	87.9%	94.4%	(84.8%)
Less than everyday	31.8%	19.8%	15.6%	12.1%	5.6%	(15.2%)
(n)	(66)	(81)	(96)	(99)	(124)	466
Less than great deal[c]						
Everyday	45.0%	78.3%	66.7%	77.3%	87.2%	(70.6%)
Less than everyday	55.0%	21.7%	33.3%	22.7%	12.8%	(29.4%)
(n)	(40)	(46)	(33)	(22)	(39)	180

[a]The information/intrapersonal statement used in this study was: To keep up with latest events.

[b]$\chi^2 = 24.92$; df = 4; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.2312$

[c]$\chi^2 = 19.80$; df = 4; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.3317$

TABLE 6

CROSSTABULATION: READERSHIP PATTERN
BY INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL VARIABLE

	Information/Intrapersonal[a]		
Readership Pattern:	Great deal	Less than great deal	(Total)
Multiple editions	38.0%	25.1%	(34.4%)
Suburban	26.3%	31.1%	(27.6%)
Evening metropolitan	21.4%	21.3%	(21.4%)
Morning metropolitan	14.3%	22.4%	(16.5%)
(n)	(476)	(183)	659

$\chi^2 = 12.79$; df = 3; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.1393$

[a]The information/intrapersonal statement used in this study was: To keep up with latest events.

TABLE 7

CROSSTABULATION: READERSHIP PATTERN BY ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL VARIABLE

Readership Pattern:	Entertainment/Intrapersonal[a]			
	Great deal	Somewhat	Not at all	(Total)
Multiple editions	37.6%	37.1%	27.1%	(34.6%)
Suburban	18.3%	25.8%	40.7%	(27.5%)
Evening metropolitan	25.4%	22.6%	14.7%	(21.3%)
Morning metropolitan	18.8%	14.5%	17.5%	(16.6%)
(n)	(197)	(283)	(177)	657

$\chi^2 = 28.24$; df = 6; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.1466$

[a]The entertainment/intrapersonal statement used for this study was: To be entertained.

TABLE 8

CROSSTABULATION: READERSHIP PATTERN BY AGE

Readership Pattern	Age in years: 29 and under	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 and over	(Total)
Multiple editions	23.9%	22.3%	40.2%	44.7%	37.1%	(34.0%)
Suburban	33.9%	29.2%	29.5%	22.0%	25.9%	(27.9%)
Evening metropolitan	26.6%	26.9%	13.6%	21.1%	19.4%	(21.2%)
Morning metropolitan	15.6%	21.5%	16.7%	12.2%	17.6%	(16.9%)
(n)	(109)	(130)	(132)	(123)	(170)	664

$\chi^2 = 28.81$; df = 12; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.1203$

TABLE 9

CROSSTABULATION: READERSHIP PATTERN BY SEX

Readership Pattern	Sex		
	Female	Male	(Total)
Multiple editions	30.6%	38.7%	(34.1%)
Suburban	29.3%	25.7%	(27.8%)
Evening Metropolitan	25.4%	16.2%	(21.5%)
Morning Metropolitan	14.7%	19.4%	(16.7%)
(n)	(382)	(284)	666

$\chi^2 = 12.49$; df = 3; $p \leq 0.01$; $\phi' = 0.3697$

TABLE 10

CANONICAL CORRELATION: READERSHIP PATTERN BY DEMOGRAPHIC AND USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS VARIABLES

Independent/Predictor Variables	Canonical loadings(s)	
	I	II
ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	+0.548	+0.173
FIFTIES	+0.310	+0.333
ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL: SOMEWHAT	+0.307	-0.078
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED	+0.302	-0.044
"NONWHITE"	+0.302	-0.232
SIXTIES	+0.274	+0.269
INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	+0.245	+0.132
SOME EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL	+0.236	-0.102
"INFORMATION/INTERPERSONAL: NOT AT ALL"	+0.210	-0.191
"ENTERTAINMENT/INTERPERSONAL: NOT AT ALL"	+0.180	-0.150
"MALE"	+0.104	+0.349
ENTERTAINMENT/INTERPERSONAL: GREAT DEAL	+0.056	+0.096
FORTIES	-0.021	+0.497
INFORMATION/INTERPERSONAL: SOMEWHAT	-0.080	+0.193
FEMALE	-0.104	-0.349
THIRTIES	-0.132	-0.627
COLLEGE COMPLETED	-0.197	+0.455
ENTERTAINMENT/INTERPERSONAL: SOMEWHAT	-0.237	+0.054
"INFORMATION/INTRAPERSONAL: NOT AT ALL"	-0.245	-0.132
WHITE	-0.302	+0.232
"LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION"	-0.341	-0.309
"TWENTIES"	-0.431	-0.472
"ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL: NOT AT ALL"	-0.885	+0.251
Dependent/Criterion Variables		
MULTIPLE	+0.630	+0.879
EVENING	+0.475	-0.879
"MORNING"	-0.155	-0.275
SUBURBAN	-0.950	+0.275
Eigenvalue(s)	0.077	0.060
Canonical correlations(s)	0.278	0.245
Wilk's lambda	0.838	0.908
Increments in Wilk's lambda	-----	0.070
χ^2	112.047	60.966
(df)	(48)	(30)
Level of significance	$p \leq 0.01$	$p \leq 0.01$

TABLE 11

CROSSTABULATION: READERSHIP PATTERN BY ENTERTAINMENT/INTRAPERSONAL VARIABLE CONTROLLED FOR AGE

Age in years / Readership Pattern	Entertainment/Intrapersonal[a]			
	Great deal	Somewhat	Not at all	(Total)
29 and under[b]				
Multiple editions	33.3%	19.6%	18.2%	(23.6%)
Suburban	30.3%	25.5%	59.1%	(34.0%)
Evening metropolitan	21.2%	33.3%	22.7%	(27.4%)
Morning metropolitan	15.2%	21.6%	zero	(15.1%)
(n)	(33)	(51)	(22)	106
40-49[c]				
Multiple editions	50.0%	45.3%	24.2%	(41.1%)
Suburban	9.4%	29.7%	48.5%	(29.5%)
Evening metropolitan	12.5%	12.5%	12.1%	(12.4%)
Morning metropolitan	28.1%	12.5%	15.2%	(17.1%)
(n)	(32)	(64)	(33)	129

TABLE 11 -Continued

Age in years Readership Pattern	Entertainment/Intrapersonal[a]			
	Great deal	Somewhat	Not at all	(Total)
50-59[d]				
Multiple editions	50.0%	49.2%	30.8%	(45.5%)
Suburban	11.1%	20.3%	42.3%	(22.3%)
Evening metropolitan	25.0%	23.7%	7.7%	(20.7%)
Morning metropolitan	13.9%	6.8%	19.2%	(11.6%)
(n)	(36)	(59)	(26)	121
60 and over[e]				
Multiple editions	40.4%	41.5%	32.1%	(38.0%)
Suburban	15.8%	30.2%	32.1%	(25.8%)
Evening metropolitan	28.1%	18.9%	9.4%	(19.0%)
Morning metropolitan	15.8%	9.4%	26.4%	(17.2%)
(n)	(57)	(53)	(53)	163

TABLE 11-Continued

[a]The entertainment/intrapersonal statement used in this study was: To be entertained.

[b]$\chi^2 = 13.27$; df = 6; $p \leq 0.05$; $\phi' = 0.2502$

[c]$\chi^2 = 14.76$; df = 6; $p \leq 0.05$; $\phi' = 0.2392$

[d]$\chi^2 = 13.73$; df = 6; $p \leq 0.05$; $\phi' = 0.2382$

[e]$\chi^2 = 13.73$; df = 6; $p \leq 0.05$; $\phi' = 0.2052$